

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE  
NASHVILLE DIVISION

RICHARD CURTIS ROGERS,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	NO. 3:18-cv-01388
v.	)	JUDGE RICHARDSON
	)	
SOUTHERN HEALTH PARTNERS,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
	)	

**ORDER**

Pending before the Court is a Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 31), to which no Objections have been filed.

The failure to object to a report and recommendation releases the Court from its duty to independently review the matter. *Frias v. Frias*, No. 2:18-cv-00076, 2019 WL 549506, at \*2 (M.D. Tenn. Feb. 12, 2019); *Hart v. Bee Property Mgmt.*, Case No. 18-cv-11851, 2019 WL 1242372, at \*1 (E.D. Mich. March 18, 2019) (citing *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985)). The district court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, those aspects of the report and recommendation to which no objection is made. *Ashraf v. Adventist Health System/Sunbelt, Inc.*, 322 F. Supp. 3d 879, 881 (W.D. Tenn. 2018); *Benson v. Walden Security*, Case No. 3:18-cv-0010, 2018 WL 6322332, at \*3 (M.D. Tenn. Dec. 4, 2018). The district court should adopt the magistrate judge's findings and rulings to which no specific objection is filed. *Id.*

The Court has reviewed the Report and Recommendation, and the Report and Recommendation is adopted and approved. Accordingly, this action is **DISMISSED without prejudice**, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b) for failure to prosecute, and the Clerk is directed to

close the file. Consequently, Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. No. 24) is **DENIED** as moot. This Order shall constitute final judgment for purposes of Fed. R. Civ. P. 58.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

  
ELI RICHARDSON  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE